

WORKLOAD STUDY

OCTOBER 9, 2007

DIVISION OF CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES

UTAH DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction and Background to Study
II.	The Study
III.	Summary of Results
IV.	Detailed Study Findings
	a. Out-of-Home Cases
	i. Urban vs. Rural
	ii. Worker Caseload
	iii. Removal Reason
	iv. Age of Case
	v. Worker Experience
	vi. Siblings vs. Non-Siblings
	vii. Placement in Region or Out
	b. Home-Based Cases
	i. Urban vs. Rural
	ii. CCS Cases
	iii. IHS Cases
	iv. PFP Cases
	v. PFR Cases
	vi. PSC Cases
	vii. PSS Cases
	c. Child Protective Services (CPS) Cases
	i. Urban vs. Rural
	ii. Substance Abuse
	iii. Supported vs. Unsupported
	iv. Severe/Chronic Cases
	v. Domestic Violence
V.	Exhibit A – SCF Detail – DCFS Workload Study – September 2007
VI.	Exhibit B – CPS Cases Study Supporting Detail
VII.	Exhibit C – Home-Based Cases Study Supporting Detail
VIII.	Exhibit D – Current, Recommended and Standard Caseload Standards
IX.	Exhibit E – Study Charter and Committee Composition
X.	Exhibit F – Workload Study Methodology

Division of Child and Family Services Workload Study

I. Introduction and Background to Study

The Division of Child and Family Services (DCFS) has periodically conducted studies to assist managers in determining a reasonable caseload for caseworkers. Average caseload numbers are also utilized to support staffing requests to the Legislature and the Governor's Office. In addition, in 2002 the Utah Legislative Auditor's office conducted a limited study and recommended caseload levels in support of DCFS' staffing requirements. Past studies have concentrated on focus groups, time studies, and limited documentation of major activities of casework. Generally, the studies have recommended caseloads between 12 and 15 per caseworker.

Incorporation of the Practice Model into DCFS casework, new federal and legislative requirements, development of a computerized case management system, growth in child populations, increases in domestic violence and substance abuse, and various other impacts on casework have required a more up-to-date analysis of the time requirements for managing cases. The federal court has monitored caseloads as part of the David C. v. Leavitt class action lawsuit, and this workload study is also part of the parties' stipulated exit from federal court oversight.

The Child Welfare League of America published recommended standards for worker caseloads and stressed the importance of standards in developing workloads. While they did provide a recommended standard for different types of cases (for example, 12 for Child Protective Services investigation), they also state:

“Although the field could benefit from a standardized caseload/workload model, currently there is no tested and universally accepted formula. It is difficult to arrive at a specific figure for a given caseload/workload because of the wide range of agency settings in which a particular service is offered.”¹

Caseloads, while a measure of work, do not provide the complete picture of case management requirements. Different factors in cases generate different workloads for the same number of cases. Urban versus rural situations, reasons for the child's entry into the system, the permanency goal (reunification, adoption, etc.), stability of the case, and the number of siblings placed in the same home are some of the factors that may affect time requirements of a case. This study was developed to address not only caseloads but to identify those major factors that seem to make a difference in the time required by the caseworker. Better identification of time requirements of the various activities of a case and the different conditions of a case will assist supervisors in assigning cases. This study, in addition to verifying the current standard, will also provide supervisors needed information in weighing their caseworkers' actual workload.

¹ Recommended Caseload/Workload Standards, Child Welfare League of America, June, 2000, p4

II. The Study

During the period from February 1 through August 23, 2007, caseworkers in the division were asked to record actual time spent on a specific case. The myriad of different activities related to casework were combined into a limited number of broad categories. Previous studies were too detailed, requiring caseworkers to break time down into as many as 50 different activities for a given case. It was determined that Out-of-Home Care (SCF) cases could be broken down into 13 major elements, while Home-Based (HB) and Child Protective Services (CPS) cases could have time categorized into 9 different elements. To simplify recording of time and accumulation of data, a form in SAFE (Utah's Statewide Automated Child Welfare Information System – SACWIS) was developed where the caseworker could record the time expended in one or more of the defined activities for the selected case on a daily basis.

Previous time-recording studies were limited in the number of participants, resulting in inadequate data when cases were closed early, workers left, or other conditions further reduced the number in the sample. In order to increase the number of cases studied and thereby provide a more statistically sound sample, the sample population was increased by requesting that every caseworker record time on one case. SCF and HB cases were selected by the study committee to provide a more stratified sample that would include some of the factors that the committee hypothesized would influence time on cases. A listing from SAFE of current cases by caseworker was utilized, selecting the first case listed for each worker. Exceptions were made to ensure a sufficient number of new cases and to account for the initial time required to set up a case, meet the principals, and establish child and family team meetings. Several workers were asked to select the next new case assigned. CPS caseworkers were told to select the next CPS case assigned and follow it through to completion. SCF and HB caseworkers were told to record time on the case for a period of six months or until the case closed if it closed prior to the six-month timeframe. Each region provided a member of the study committee who was responsible to work with caseworkers in the region to help set up the study and be available to answer questions. The data staff at the state office were available by telephone or email to provide assistance with questions or data entry problems. The study started in February 2007 and terminated on August 23, 2007. When the study began there were 201 caseworkers whose primary duty was SCF cases, 85 workers whose primary duty was HB cases, and 124 workers whose primary duty was CPS cases. Each worker was requested to maintain a time log on one case during the study period. An important aspect of caseload determination is the net time available to caseworkers to perform casework, excluding time spent for vacations, meetings, training, etc.

This study adopted the conclusion of prior studies that uniformly determined that 68% of total time was available for casework. It may be advisable to conduct a new study if management determines there have been sufficient changes in demands on caseworkers' time not directly related to casework.

This study does not address how time should be spent nor does it try to determine the ideal allocation of time. It does show what is happening and how workers spend time on cases. It also does not correlate caseload with casework. Many factors influence the quality of casework, and

the correlation between caseload and quality casework is difficult if not impossible to isolate in the context of this study. However, it is clear from the study that caseworkers have less time to spend on each case when their caseload is larger. As a matter of management philosophy, caseload size will be carefully monitored. Restricting caseloads so that caseworkers can devote adequate time to each family is central to the Division's mission. DCFS will request appropriate resources from the Legislature so that caseload size can be professionally managed.

III. Summary of Results

Of the potential 201 SCF caseworkers who were asked to maintain a log on one case, 133 (66%) maintained a log; of the 85 HB caseworkers, 66 (78%) maintained a log on one case; and of the 124 CPS workers, 109 (88%) maintained a log on one case. The total number of SCF cases logged (133) represented 5.5% of all SCF cases open during that period; the 66 HB cases were 1.6% of cases open during the period; and the 109 CPS cases represented 1% of the CPS cases open during the period. The size and randomness of the sample is believed to be adequate to fairly represent the population. Based on the prior studies discussed above, this study adopted the conclusion that 68% of time was used in casework. As a result, this study concluded that in a given month of 20.75 working days, 112.88 hours would be available for casework. Other than the non-casework time, this study's methodology was similar to that conducted by the Legislative Auditors in 2002. The number of categories for recording time in this study was condensed from the auditor's study whereas the number of participants was increased. Both studies required caseworkers to record time concurrent with the time of the activity.

Using average number of hours per day spent on cases, a current average caseload for SCF was determined to be 14.6 cases, 17 for HB, and 12 for CPS. Overall these numbers, except for HB, are close to the current actual caseload averages. For the fourth quarter of FY 2007, the actual caseload for SCF averaged 14.1 cases/worker, for CPS 13.5, and for HB 13.1. In 2002, the Utah Legislative Auditor's Office recommended a caseload of 15 for CPS and HB, and 12 for SCF cases.

While DCFS may want to consider changing the standard for SCF and CPS based on the results of this study, HB caseloads bear further research before any recommendations can be made. The study of HB cases encountered several problems, including the number of different types of HB cases; differing interpretations of a case type between regions; and the small number in the sample for all except PSS cases. It is recommended that further study be made after the DCFS In-home Workgroup has completed its comprehensive review of HB services and has made recommendations to standardize the different types of cases.

There were significant differences in time requirements when cases are broken down by urban/rural, case goals, etc. These are discussed in detail in the body of the report. Also, time required for the different case factors (travel, visits, etc.) varies with the type of case. The major time elements of a SCF case are: client visits 25%, collateral visits 18%, travel 19%, and documentation 15%. Documentation in the past utilized approximately 20% of a caseworker's time. The major time elements of a HB case were: client contact 34%, travel 17%, and documentation 17%. On CPS cases, 25% of the time was spent in client contact, 26% in documentation, 16% in travel, and 13% in collateral contacts.

IV. Detailed Study Findings

1. Out-of-Home Cases

- a. **Urban vs. Rural:** Overall there is a minor difference in total time required to manage an urban versus a rural case. This would indicate that the standard caseload for urban workers should not differ materially from that of rural caseworkers. The study shows an urban worker could carry a slightly heavier caseload (14.7 cases) than a rural caseworker (14.1 cases). However, case activities differed between the cases with travel in rural cases averaging 13.2 hours per case and requiring 36% of case time compared to 4.3 hours per case and 14% of case time for urban cases. Conversely, oversight and placement activities averaged 2.3 hours per case for urban cases compared to 1.6 hours for rural cases. Client and collateral visits averaged 13.8 hours per case and consumed 44.8% of urban case time compared with 12.6 hours per case and 34.5% of rural case time.
- b. **Worker Caseload:** Workers who maintained a heavier caseload during the period of the study spent less time on a case. This may be due either to efficiency or due to a caseworker with more cases having less time to spend on each case. The suggested caseload based on the number of cases workers carried during the study is as follows:
 - i. 0-7 cases (n=12), 13.5 cases
 - ii. 8-11 cases (n=25), 14.2 cases
 - iii. 11.5-16 cases (n=72), 14.6 cases
 - iv. Greater than 16 cases (n=24), 15.3 cases
- c. **Removal Reason:** When the reason for removal was delinquency (n=24 cases) this removal reason created the heaviest workload. Travel, documentation and court activities took more time than for most other cases. Recommended caseload for cases with delinquency as the removal reason is 12.6, compared to 20.1 for cases where the removal was due to “parent condition/absence” (n=14 cases). The workload for sexual abuse cases (n=4 cases) suggests that a caseload of 18.1 is workable. Client contact consumes 34.9% of the time on physical abuse cases compared to 18.7% for delinquent behavior. Court takes twice as much time on physical abuse cases as for dependency cases.
- d. **Age of Case:** Not surprisingly, new cases take more caseworker time than existing cases. A caseworker with all new cases (n=37) would be expected to maintain a caseload of 12.3 cases compared to 17.4 for a worker with only older cases. Client and collateral contacts on new cases averaged 20 hours (43% of case time) compared to 11.2 hours (42.3% of case time) for older cases. More time was expended on travel and documentation in new cases (14.7 hours compared to 9.5 hours). This factor should be seriously considered by supervisors who assign cases, particularly when they assign new cases to new caseworkers.
- e. **Worker Experience.** Overall average time per case for workers with 12 months or less experience (n=37) was greater indicating a caseload of 11.9 cases compared to 16.2 for the experienced worker (n=96). However, if a less experienced caseworker had fewer cases, their ability to spend more time per case might skew the results of this study.

- f. **Siblings vs. Non-Siblings.** The study attempted to break out time for cases where there were siblings in custody compared to cases with only one child from the family. The hypothesis was that a worker with several sibling groups may not incur as much time per case as a worker whose caseload is mostly comprised of single children without siblings. However, due to the linking of cases in SAFE and the tendency to record more of the time on one of the sibling cases combined with the fact that not all related sibling cases were included in the study, it is felt that further study needs to be done before accurate conclusions can be made.
 - g. **Placement in Region or Out:** Of the 133 cases, 23 involved children who were placed out of the region. Because of travel requirements (which consumed 34.4% of time for an out-of-region case compared to 15.6% for in-region placement), the projected caseload if a child is placed within the region is 14.5 cases compared to 12.6 cases if a child is placed out of the region. Client and collateral contacts took 10% more time for cases within the region. This difference may be due to secondary workers located closer to the child doing the client contacts on the out-of-region cases instead of the primary workers that recorded their time in this study.
2. **Home-Based Cases:** In total there were 66 HB (home-based) cases entered. Total days logged were 4467 and total hours were 1410.8, which calculates to an average of 0.32 hours per day (multiply by 20.75) that is approximately 6.65 hours per month. Using these numbers, one would conclude that a total caseload should not exceed 17 cases a month.
 - a. **Urban vs. Rural:** There were 18 rural cases and 48 urban cases logged in this study. Urban cases took more time, suggesting a cap on caseload per worker of 15.6 cases. The study indicated that a rural worker could carry up to 21 cases per worker. However, the mix of types of cases in rural areas compared to urban had an impact on the study results. There were more family preservation cases in urban areas where the current caseload is considered to be five cases and more counseling cases in rural areas that require less time and less documentation. Travel takes more time per case for rural workers (4.7 hrs.) compared to urban (3.3 hrs). Urban cases require more time for client contacts, child and family team activities, court and oversight. Documentation requires 20% of time for a rural case and 16% for urban cases.
 - b. **CCS Cases (Clinical Counseling):** There were three CCS cases entered. Total days logged were 240 and total hours were 104.7, which calculates to an average of 0.44 hours per day (multiply by 20.75), approximately 9.2 hours per month, or a suggested caseload of 12.3 cases.
 - c. **IHS Cases (Individual Home Study):** There were three IHS cases entered. Total days logged were 173 and total hours were 16.9, which calculates to an average of 0.10 hours per day (multiply by 20.75) that is approximately 2.1 hours per month, or a total of 54 cases a month. Client contact, travel and documentation consume most of the time for HIS cases. The small number in the sample may invalidate the study recommendation for this type case.
 - d. **PFP Cases (Protective Family Preservation):** There were eight PFP cases entered. Total days logged were 489 and total hours were 226.9, which calculates to an

average of 0.46 hours per day (multiply by 20.75) that is approximately 9.6 hours per month, or a total of 11.7 cases a month. Almost 50% of the casework time was coded to client contacts. The indicated standard of 11.7 cases as a caseload is significantly higher than current caseload standards for PFP workers. More study may be needed before adjusting the standard.

- e. **PFR Cases (Protective Family Reunification):** There were two PFR cases entered. Total days logged were 190 and total hours were 89.4, which calculates to an average of 0.47 hours per day (multiply by 20.75) that is approximately 9.7 hours per month, or a total of 11.6 cases a month. While the number of cases is small, the results are quite similar to PFP cases, which are currently considered to require approximately the same case effort and standard caseload.
 - f. **PSC Cases (Protective Service Counseling –Voluntary):** There were five PSC cases entered. Total days logged were 485 and total hours were 81.5, which calculates to an average of 0.17 hours per day (multiply by 20.75) that is approximately 3.5 hours per month, or suggesting a total caseload of 32 cases a month. This is a significantly higher caseload than the current standard of 15. Further study is recommended to determine if there were particular circumstances (for example: were they all older cases? Were the family problems less serious than usual? Was the sample size too small?) that would invalidate the results of this study.
 - g. **PSS Cases (Protective Service Supervision - Court-Ordered):** PSS cases currently represent the majority of home-based cases, particularly with regard to the number of workers involved and the overall effort required to maintain the cases. There were 43 PSS cases entered. Total days logged were 2742 and total hours were 862, which calculates to an average of 0.31 hours per day (multiply by 20.75) that is approximately 6.5 hours per month, or a total of 17 cases a month. Almost 44% of case time was logged to client and collateral contacts. Court activities accounted for another 10% of the time.
3. **Child Protective Services (CPS) Cases:** The standard time allowed for completion of a CPS case is 30 days. Time required for cases in the study included all time from the start of the case to the case ending. Overall there were 124 cases included in the study. CPS cases show an average of 9.8 hours per case. This would recommend that workers be assigned approximately 12 cases per month. Since the study sample size is quite small (1%) and the time required for a CPS case is short, it may be advisable to continue the study before adjusting CPS case goals. An additional study could be completed in approximately six months.
- a. **Urban vs. Rural:** There were 15 rural cases averaging 8 hours per case and 109 urban cases averaging 10.1 hours per case. This would equate to a standard caseload of 14 for rural workers and 11 for urban workers. Although travel took approximately the same time for a rural as an urban case (1.61 vs. 1.59 hours), travel took 20% of the case time for rural cases compared to 15.7% of urban cases. Documentation, removal activities and oversight took more time for urban cases.
 - b. **Substance Abuse:** Substance abuse is a frequent cause of family problems and of removal of children from their homes. Cases were identified as to whether or not

substance abuse was a contributing factor in the case. There were 18 cases where substance abuse was a factor and 106 where it was not. Substance abuse contributed significantly to the time required for the case and where possible, it should be a factor considered by supervisors who assign CPS cases. More time was required in substance abuse cases for documentation and removal activities. A CPS worker with only substance abuse investigations may be able to handle an optimum caseload of only 5.2 cases compared to 14.3 cases with other contributing concerns.

- c. **Supported vs. Unsupported:** There were 56 supported cases compared to 67 unsupported. Overall, the division supports approximately 40% of the cases investigated. The number supported in this sample is slightly higher than the norm but within an acceptable range. Supported cases require almost twice the time as unsupported cases, with caseloads of 8.7 and 15.4 recommended respectively. Collateral contacts and travel time were much higher than in the supported cases. However time recorded as “investigative time” was similar. Since it is generally not known until the end of a case whether the case is supported or unsupported, this information may only be useful to supervisors in evaluating performance and overall caseload of their caseworkers, not in assigning cases.
- d. **Severe/chronic cases:** The number of severe cases (3) was too small to provide reliable data. However, it did indicate, as would be expected, that severe case require more time (10 vs. 11.5 cases as a standard). Severe cases took twice the time in client contacts as other cases.
- e. **Domestic Violence:** There were 25 cases with domestic violence as a factor and 99 where it was not. Based on the findings, a standard of 8.5 would be acceptable for domestic violence cases compared to 12.5 where there is no domestic violence. Almost uniformly, all factors took more time in the domestic violence cases.

Summary of Findings

- The study suggests that a CPS caseload ratio of 15 cases per worker may be too high, and also that a more appropriate ratio is 12 cases per worker. The current CPS caseload average is 13.5.
- The study suggests that a SCF caseload ratio of 15 (14.6) cases per worker may represent a manageable caseload. The current average is 14.1 cases per worker.
- Further study is needed to establish caseload ratios for HB cases.
- There is no significant difference in the ratio for rural and urban caseloads.

Recommendations

1. Based on the findings, it is recommended that the Department and the Division move toward reducing the caseload ratio of CPS cases closer to 12 cases per worker.
2. Based on the findings, it is recommended that the Division and Department commit to reducing the CPS caseload, and address this goal in its funding requests for the next legislative session if possible.

- 3. Based on the findings, it is recommended that the Department and the Division monitor the out-of-home caseload ratios to ensure that there is no movement towards 15 cases per worker. The current caseload ratios (14.1) have been consistent for the last two years, and are within the ratios established by the Child Welfare League of America (12-15).**
- 4. Based on the findings, it is recommended that further study be conducted on home-based caseload ratios. Information generated in this study was inconclusive, but should be shared with the existing home-based work group for their use**
- 5. Part B of the Workload Study (regarding supervisor ratios) should be completed within 30 days, and further recommendations will be added to this report by November 30, 2007.**

EXHIBIT A
SCF Detail - DCFS Workload Study - September 2007

Time spent on case by function

Location	Total Days	Total Cases	Total Hours	Case Initiation	Client Contact	Collateral Contact	Travel	Documentation	CFTM Activities	Court Activities	Oversight	Placement	ICWA	TAL	AD	Other	Total	Suggested Caseload
Rural	2479	26	953.9															
Hours				2.6	186.9	142.6	345.4	118.6	39.8	40.6	8.6	34	1.8	2.8	1.3	28.9	953.9	
Hrs/case				0.10	7.19	5.48	13.28	4.56	1.53	1.56	0.33	1.31	0.07	0.11	0.05	1.11		
% total				0.3%	19.6%	14.9%	36.2%	12.4%	4.2%	4.3%	0.9%	3.6%	0.2%	0.3%	0.1%	3.0%	100.0%	
Hrs/mo/case				0.02	1.56	1.19	2.89	0.99	0.33	0.34	0.07	0.28	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.24	7.98	14.14
Urban	8929	107	3303.6															
Hours				27.5	860	622.1	457.4	538.7	178.6	226.7	80	166.8	2.6	11.9	17.6	113.7	3303.6	
Hrs/case				0.26	8.04	5.81	4.27	5.03	1.67	2.12	0.75	1.56	0.02	0.11	0.16	1.06		
% total				0.8%	26.0%	18.8%	13.8%	16.3%	5.4%	6.9%	2.4%	5.0%	0.1%	0.4%	0.5%	3.4%	100.0%	
Hrs/mo/case				0.06	2.00	1.45	1.06	1.25	0.42	0.53	0.19	0.39	0.01	0.03	0.04	0.26	7.68	14.70
All	11408	133	4257.5															
Hours				30.1	1046.9	764.7	802.8	657.3	218.4	267.3	88.6	200.8	4.4	14.7	18.9	142.6	4257.5	
Hrs/case				0.23	7.87	5.75	6.04	4.94	1.64	2.01	0.67	1.51	0.03	0.11	0.14	1.07		
% total				0.7%	24.6%	18.0%	18.9%	15.4%	5.1%	6.3%	2.1%	4.7%	0.1%	0.3%	0.4%	3.3%	100.0%	
Hrs/mo/case				0.05	1.90	1.39	1.46	1.20	0.40	0.49	0.16	0.37	0.01	0.03	0.03	0.26	7.74	14.58
Hrs/mo/case																		

By Goal

Adoption	2324	29	699															
Hours				6.3	148.4	93.7	163.1	116.6	27.3	60.5	8.8	39.2	1.1	0	17.8	16.2		
Hrs/case				0.22	5.12	3.23	5.62	4.02	0.94	2.09	0.30	1.35	0.04	0.00	0.61	0.56		
% total				0.9%	21.2%	13.4%	23.3%	16.7%	3.9%	8.7%	1.3%	5.6%	0.2%	0.0%	2.5%	2.3%	100.0%	
Hrs/mo/case				0.06	1.33	0.84	1.46	1.04	0.24	0.54	0.08	0.35	0.01	0.00	0.16	0.14	6.2	18.09

Guard.non/rel.	278	5	108.5															
Hours				4.8	24.5	19.1	13.9	11	6.6	7.8	0	16.9	0	0	0	3.9		
Hrs/case				0.96	4.9	3.82	2.78	2.2	1.32	1.56	0	3.38	0	0	0	0.78		

Time spent on case by function

Age of Case

[illegible]

EXHIBIT A
SCF Detail - DCFS Workload Study - September 2007

Time spent on case by function

Location	Total Days	Total Cases	Total Hours	Case Initiation	Client Contact	Collateral Contact	Travel	Documentation	CFTM Activities	Court Activities	Oversight	Placement	ICWA	TAL	AD	Other	Total	Suggested Caseload
Hours				9.6	591.4	481.5	528	384.4	137.4	169.4	31.6	102.5	3.9	13.4	18.4	67.7	2539.2	
Hrs/case				0.10	6.16	5.02	5.50	4.00	1.43	1.76	0.33	1.07	0.04	0.14	0.19	0.71		
% total				0.4%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Hrs/mo/case				0.02	1.51	1.23	1.35	0.98	0.35	0.43	0.08	0.26	0.01	0.03	0.05	0.17	6.50	17.36

Removal Reason

Adoptive Failure	395	4	144.7															
Hours				0	52.2	22.1	23.6	19.4	7.9	5.9	0	6.2	0	0	2.8	4.6	144.7	
Hrs/case				0.00	13.05	5.53	5.90	4.85	1.98	1.48	0.00	1.55	0.00	0.00	0.70	1.15		
% total				0.0%	36.1%	15.3%	16.3%	13.4%	5.5%	4.1%	0.0%	4.3%	0.0%	0.0%	1.9%	3.2%	100.0%	
Hrs/mo/case				0.00	2.74	1.16	1.24	1.02	0.42	0.31	0.00	0.33	0.00	0.00	0.15	0.24	7.60	14.85

Delinquent Beh.	2114	24	911.7															
Hours				3.3	170.5	167.1	205.1	165.1	44.2	67.4	9.3	35.3	0	7.3	0	37.1	911.7	
Hrs/case				0.14	7.10	6.96	8.55	6.88	1.84	2.81	0.39	1.47	0.00	0.30	0.00	1.55		
% total				0.4%	18.7%	18.3%	22.5%	18.1%	4.8%	7.4%	1.0%	3.9%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	4.1%	100.0%	
Hrs/mo/case				0.03	1.67	1.64	2.01	1.62	0.43	0.66	0.09	0.35	0.00	0.07	0.00	0.36	8.95	12.61

Dependency	2407	28	828.5															
Hours				9.8	202.6	189.7	151.4	108.1	50.5	37.9	4.1	46.7	0	3.6	1.9	22.2	828.5	
Hrs/case				0.35	7.24	6.78	5.41	3.86	1.80	1.35	0.15	1.67	0.00	0.13	0.07	0.79		
% total				1.2%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Hrs/mo/case				0.08	1.75	1.64	1.31	0.93	0.44	0.33	0.04	0.40	0.00	0.03	0.02	0.19	7.14	15.80

Neglect	3669	43	1424.1															
Hours				14.6	346.9	267.3	262	189.7	72.2	86.3	61.4	71.5	4.4	2.7	1.2	43.9	1424.1	
Hrs/case				0.34	8.07	6.22	6.09	4.41	1.68	2.01	1.43	1.66	0.10	0.06	0.03	1.02		
% total				1.0%	24.4%	18.8%	18.4%	13.3%	5.1%	6.1%	4.3%	5.0%	0.3%	0.2%	0.1%	3.1%	100.0%	
Hrs/mo/case				0.08	1.96	1.51	1.48	1.07	0.41	0.49	0.35	0.40	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.25	8.05	14.02

EXHIBIT A
SCF Detail - DCFS Workload Study - September 2007

Time spent on case by function

Location	Total Days	Total Cases	Total Hours	Case Initiation	Client Contact	Collateral Contact	Travel	Documentation	CFTM Activities	Court Activities	Oversight	Placement	ICWA	TAL	AD	Other	Total	Suggested Caseload
----------	------------	-------------	-------------	-----------------	----------------	--------------------	--------	---------------	-----------------	------------------	-----------	-----------	------	-----	----	-------	-------	--------------------

Parent Cond/Absn	1395	14	376.7															
Hours				1.8	94.8	45.5	62.1	69.2	18.3	23.4	4.1	29.5	0	1.1	12.4	14.5	376.7	
Hrs/case				0.13	6.77	3.25	4.44	4.94	1.31	1.67	0.29	2.11	0.00	0.08	0.89	1.04		
% total				0.5%	25.2%	12.1%	16.5%	18.4%	4.9%	6.2%	1.1%	7.8%	0.0%	0.3%	3.3%	3.8%	100.0%	
Hrs/mo/case				0.03	1.41	0.68	0.92	1.03	0.27	0.35	0.06	0.44	0.00	0.02	0.18	0.22	5.60	20.15

Physical Abuse	925	8	254.5															
Hours				0	88.9	33.2	24.3	61.4	5.9	18.8	4.6	6.2	0	0	0	11.2	254.5	
Hrs/case				0.00	11.11	4.15	3.04	7.68	0.74	2.35	0.58	0.78	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.40		
% total				0.0%	34.9%	13.0%	9.5%	24.1%	2.3%	7.4%	1.8%	2.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.4%	100.0%	
Hrs/mo/case				0.00	1.99	0.74	0.55	1.38	0.13	0.42	0.10	0.14	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.25	5.71	19.77

Sexual Abuse	144	4	42.4															
Hours				0	17	4.1	7.5	6.4	4.3	1.5	1	0.3	0	0	0	0.3	42.4	
Hrs/case				0.00	4.25	1.03	1.88	1.60	1.08	0.38	0.25	0.08	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.08		
% total				0.0%	40.1%	9.7%	17.7%	15.1%	10.1%	3.5%	2.4%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	100.0%	
Hrs/mo/case				0.00	2.45	0.59	1.08	0.92	0.62	0.22	0.14	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.04	6.11	18.48

Location of Client

In Region	9416	110	3522.1															
Hours				25.2	920.6	645	549.7	568.4	189.2	220.2	85.5	161.6	3.3	12.1	17.5	123.8	3522.1	
Hrs/case				0.229	8.369	5.864	4.997	5.167	1.720	2.002	0.777	1.469	0.030	0.110	0.159	1.125		
% total				0.7%	26.1%	18.3%	15.6%	16.1%	5.4%	6.3%	2.4%	4.6%	0.1%	0.3%	0.5%	3.5%	100.0%	
Hrs/mo/case				0.06	2.03	1.42	1.21	1.25	0.42	0.49	0.19	0.36	0.01	0.03	0.04	0.27	7.76	14.54

Out of Region	1700	23	735.4															
Hours				4.9	126.3	119.7	253.1	88.9	29.2	47.1	3.1	39.2	1.1	2.6	1.4	18.8	735.4	
Hrs/case				0.007	0.172	0.163	0.344	0.121	0.040	0.064	0.004	0.053	0.001	0.004	0.002	0.026		

EXHIBIT A

SCF Detail - DCFS Workload Study - September 2007

Time spent on case by function

Location	Total Days	Total Cases	Total Hours	Case Initiation	Client Contact	Collateral Contact	Travel	Documentation	CFTM Activities	Court Activities	Oversight	Placement	ICWA	TAL	AD	Other	Total	Suggested Caseload
% total				0.7%	17.2%	16.3%	34.4%	12.1%	4.0%	6.4%	0.4%	5.3%	0.1%	0.4%	0.2%	2.6%	100.0%	
Hrs/mo/case				0.06	1.54	1.46	3.09	1.09	0.36	0.57	0.04	0.48	0.01	0.03	0.02	0.23	8.98	12.58

EXHIBIT B

CPS Cases

Time spent on case by function

Location or Case type	Total Days	Total Cases	Total Hours	Investigation	Client Contact	Collateral Contact	Travel	Documentation	Removal Activities	Ongoing Svc	Oversight	Other	Total	Suggested Caseload*
Rural	546	15	120.2											
Hours				11.4	34.9	17.7	24.2	27.6	0	4	0	0.4	119.8	
Hrs/case				0.76	2.33	1.18	1.61	1.84	0.00	0.27	0.00	0.03	7.99	14.13
% total				9.5%	29.1%	14.8%	20.2%	23.0%	0.0%	3.3%	0.0%	0.3%	100.0%	

Urban	3652	109	1104.5											
Hours				58.9	269.4	142.7	173.9	292.7	57.4	20.3	5.4	83.8	1104.5	
Hrs/case				0.54	2.47	1.31	1.60	2.69	0.53	0.19	0.05	0.77	10.13	11.14
% total				5.3%	24.4%	12.9%	15.7%	26.5%	5.2%	1.8%	0.5%	7.6%	100.0%	

All	4198	124	1224.7											
Hours				70.3	304.3	160.4	198.1	320.3	57.4	24.3	5.4	84.2	1224.3	
Hrs/case				0.57	2.45	1.29	1.60	2.58	0.46	0.20	0.04	0.68	9.87	11.43
% total				5.7%	24.9%	13.1%	16.2%	26.2%	4.7%	2.0%	0.4%	6.9%	100.0%	

Supported	2126	56	726.6											
Hours				31.7	152.4	95.3	127.5	168.6	57.3	23.4	3.9	66.5	726.6	
Hrs/case				0.57	2.72	1.70	2.28	3.01	1.02	0.42	0.07	1.19	12.98	8.70
% total				4.4%	21.0%	13.1%	17.5%	23.2%	7.9%	3.2%	0.5%	9.2%	100.0%	

Unsupported	1912	67	492.2											
Hours				38.4	148.1	64.6	70.6	150.6	0.1	0.9	1.5	17.4	492.2	
Hrs/case				0.57	2.21	0.96	1.05	2.25	0.00	0.01	0.02	0.26	7.35	15.37
% total				7.8%	30.1%	13.1%	14.3%	30.6%	0.0%	0.2%	0.3%	3.5%	100.0%	

Not Severe/chronic	4087	121	1190.7											
Hours				69.5	291.8	153	194.2	312.5	57.1	23	5.4	84.2	1190.7	
Hrs/case				0.57	2.41	1.26	1.60	2.58	0.47	0.19	0.04	0.70	9.84	11.47
% total				5.8%	24.5%	12.8%	16.3%	26.2%	4.8%	1.9%	0.5%	7.1%	100.0%	

EXHIBIT B
CPS Cases

Time spent on case by function

Location or Case type	Total Days	Total Cases	Total Hours	Invest- igation	Client Contact	Collateral Contact	Travel	Documen- tation	Removal Activities	Ongoing Svc	Oversight	Other	Total	Suggested Caseload*
Severe/Chronic	102	3	34											
Hours				0.8	12.5	7.4	3.9	7.8	0.3	1.3	0	0	34	
Hrs/case				0.27	4.17	2.47	1.30	2.60	0.10	0.43	0.00	0.00	11.33	9.96
% total				2.4%	36.8%	21.8%	11.5%	22.9%	0.9%	3.8%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	
Substance Abuse		18	388.1											
Hours				13.5	55.5	53.7	85.3	74.3	44.7	13.8	2.7	44.6	388.1	
Hrs/case				0.75	3.08	2.98	4.74	4.13	2.48	0.77	0.15	2.48	21.56	5.24
% total				3.5%	14.3%	13.8%	22.0%	19.1%	11.5%	3.6%	0.7%	11.5%	100.0%	
No Substance Abuse		106	836.6											
Hours				56.8	248.8	106.7	112.8	246	12.7	10.5	2.7	39.6	836.6	
Hrs/case				0.54	2.35	1.01	1.06	2.32	0.12	0.10	0.03	0.37	7.89	14.30
% total				6.8%	29.7%	12.8%	13.5%	29.4%	1.5%	1.3%	0.3%	4.7%	100.0%	

EXHIBIT C
Home-Based Cases

Time spent on case by function

Location or	Total	Total	Total	Case	Client	Collateral	Travel	Documen-	CFTM	Court	Oversight	Other	Total	Suggested
Case type	Days	Cases	Hours	Initiation	Contact	Contact		tation	Activities	Activities				Caseload*
Rural	1387	18	358.8											
Hours				0.9	116.3	51.6	85.4	73	17.2	9.6	1	3.8	358.8	
Hrs/case				0.05	6.46	2.87	4.74	4.06	0.96	0.53	0.06	0.21	19.93	
% total				0.3%	32.4%	14.4%	23.8%	20.3%	4.8%	2.7%	0.3%	1.1%		
Hrs/mo/case**				0.01	1.74	0.77	1.28	1.09	0.26	0.14	0.01	0.06	5.37	21.03

Urban	3014	48	1052											
Hours				18.3	368.3	131.4	158.9	164.9	55.3	87.4	10.1	47.4	1042	
Hrs/case				0.38	7.67	2.74	3.31	3.44	1.15	1.82	0.21	0.99	21.71	
% total				1.7%	35.0%	12.5%	15.1%	15.7%	5.3%	8.3%	1.0%	4.5%		
Hrs/mo/case				0.13	2.54	0.90	1.09	1.14	0.38	0.60	0.07	0.33	7.17	15.74

All	4401	66	1410.8											
Hours				19.2	484.6	183	244.3	237.9	72.5	97	11.1	51.2	1400.8	
Hrs/case				0.29	7.34	2.77	3.70	3.60	1.10	1.47	0.17	0.78	21.22	
% total				1.4%	34.3%	13.0%	17.3%	16.9%	5.1%	6.9%	0.8%	3.6%		
Hrs/mo/case				0.09	2.28	0.86	1.15	1.12	0.34	0.46	0.05	0.24	6.60	17.09

CCS	237	3	107.7											
Hours				0	55.5	15	13.5	10.6	8	1.5	0	0.6	104.7	
Hrs/case				0.00	18.50	5.00	4.50	3.53	2.67	0.50	0.00	0.20		
% total				0.0%	51.5%	13.9%	12.5%	9.8%	7.4%	1.4%	0.0%	0.6%		
Hrs/mo/case				0.00	4.86	1.31	1.18	0.93	0.70	0.13	0.00	0.05	9.17	12.31

HIS	171	3	16.9											
Hours				0.8	6.2	1	3.4	4.3	0.3	0	0	0.9	16.9	
Hrs/case				0.27	2.07	0.33	1.13	1.43	0.10	0.00	0.00	0.30		
% total				4.7%	36.7%	5.9%	20.1%	25.4%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	5.3%		
Hrs/mo/case				0.10	0.75	0.12	0.41	0.52	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.11	2.05	55.04

EXHIBIT C
Home-Based Cases

Time spent on case by function

Location or	Total	Total	Total	Case	Client	Collateral	Travel	Documen-	CFTM	Court	Oversight	Other	Total	Suggested
Case type	Days	Cases	Hours	Initiation	Contact	Contact		tation	Activities	Activities				Caseload*

PFP	481	8	226.9											
Hours				11.6	97.4	13	38.3	27.3	11.4	11.3	4.3	12.3	226.9	
Hrs/case				1.45	12.18	1.63	4.79	3.41	1.43	1.41	0.54	1.54		
% total				5.1%	42.9%	5.7%	16.9%	12.0%	5.0%	5.0%	1.9%	5.4%		
Hrs/mo/case				0.50	4.20	0.56	1.65	1.18	0.49	0.49	0.19	0.53	9.79	11.53

PFR	188	2	89.4											
Hours				0.8	35.1	14.6	7.6	14.8	5.5	3.5	3.5	4	89.4	
Hrs/case				0.40	17.55	7.30	3.80	7.40	2.75	1.75	1.75	2.00		
% total				0.9%	39.3%	16.3%	8.5%	16.6%	6.2%	3.9%	3.9%	4.5%		
Hrs/mo/case				0.09	3.87	1.61	0.84	1.63	0.61	0.39	0.39	0.44	9.87	11.44

PSC	480	5	81.5											
Hours				1.6	24.1	12.4	7.6	17.3	6.5	0	1.9	10.1	81.5	
Hrs/case				0.32	4.82	2.48	1.52	3.46	1.30	0.00	0.38	2.02		
% total				2.0%	29.6%	15.2%	9.3%	21.2%	8.0%	0.0%	2.3%	12.4%		
Hrs/mo/case				0.07	1.04	0.54	0.33	0.75	0.28	0.00	0.08	0.44	3.52	32.04

PSS	2699	43	862											
Hours				4.1	249.7	124.9	167.5	159.9	40.8	80.7	11.4	23	862	
Hrs/case				0.10	5.81	2.90	3.90	3.72	0.95	1.88	0.27	0.53		
% total				0.5%	29.0%	14.5%	19.4%	18.5%	4.7%	9.4%	1.3%	2.7%		
Hrs/mo/case				0.03	1.92	0.96	1.29	1.23	0.31	0.62	0.09	0.18	6.63	17.03

* Caseload based on 112.88 available hours per month for casework

** Hrs/month/case based on 20.75 days per month

EXHIBIT D
Current, Recommended and Standard Caseloads - DCFS

	CPS	In-home	SCF	Family Pres
Current Standard	15	15	12	5
Current Average for Division	13.5	13.1	14.1	5.5
CWLA Recommended Standard	12	15	12-15	2-6
Study Recommendation	12	*	14	*

* Except for PSS cases (17 recommended) inadequate data to make recommendation

Exhibit E

Study Charter and Committee Composition

The Workload Study Workgroup was authorized by the Executive Team of the Division of Child and Family Services in June of 2004 to conduct limited studies of the factors influencing caseloads. That same charter was used to expand the study based on the methodology shown in **Exhibit F** with the results of the study incorporated into the Exit Stipulation from the DAVID C court case. Following is the workgroup charter as it was initially approved. Committee membership has been updated to show members of the current study.

WORKGROUP CHARTER

Contributing Factors to Workloads/Caseload Management

June 4, 2004

Project Name: Workloads/Caseload Management: Determine factors that contribute to workload, identifying those more specific determinants that vary with types of cases, and other factors. Isolate those factors that can be utilized by management to assist supervisors in equalizing caseloads. Identify elements of workload that can be eliminated or reduced.

Charter Statement: Workers and supervisors need to have available the tools necessary to understand and equalize caseloads insofar as practical. The workgroup is responsible to identify factors that contribute most to varying workloads and establish a methodology to assist supervisors in distributing cases to staff. The workgroup is also required to select the most efficient method of measuring the effect of factors on workload including a system to continuously or periodically update the weight of the selected factors. The methodology will be required to measure the impact of changes in practices, and state and federal requirements in case management.

Customers: Management and staff of the Division of Child and Family Services and those entities to whom the division is required to report including the Department, the Governor's Office and the Legislature. Additional customers are the clients themselves as caseworkers are more effective in providing services due to greater equality in workloads.

Team Members:

1. Jack Green, Director, Finance & Info Systems, Co-chair
2. Katy, Larsen, Director, Northern Region, Co-chair (*replaced by Jeff Harrop, Associate Regional Director*)
3. Jerna Mitchell, Trainer, State Office
4. Navina Forsythe, IA Supervisor, State Office
5. Northern Region Representative: Jeff Harrop (*replaced by Kevin Jackson – Northern Region*)

6. Eastern Region Representative: Holly Vetter (Moab Office)
7. Western Region Representative: Barbara Stubbs
8. SouthWest Region Representative: Mark Hollingshead (*replaced by Kyle Garrett*)
9. Salt Lake Valley Region Representative: Sheri DeVore (*replaced by Esmeralda Malili*)
10. Office of Services Review Representative: Geniel Evenson

Definition and Importance of the Project: At a meeting with state and regional administration, issues were discussed and reviewed with the group selecting those on which effort should be focused during the next one to two years. Emphasis was on improving staff performance. Workload was considered to be an important factor in equalizing caseloads between workers, offices and regions. Although the Legislative Audit conducted a workload study and the Division has led or participated in other studies, there is no definitive analysis that weighs the various factors contributing to workload. Most reports currently measure caseload without distinguishing between the more difficult time-consuming cases and those requiring significantly less time and effort by caseworkers. In addition factors such as travel, age of case, experience of caseworkers have not been measured or weighed in determining caseloads.

The ability to effectively measure and weight factors contributing to realistic workloads can then be applied to caseloads and used as a tool to assist in determining budget allocations to regions. Equalized caseloads can assist to more accurately measure caseworker performance. Current performance measures including quality of casework, timeliness in completing of aspects of casework and reports do not address the degrees of difficulty in different cases in the same service area. Outcome results of casework with workers carrying what appear to be comparable caseloads can be positively or negatively influenced by the actual workload those cases represent. Without adequate tools to measure the impact of workload factors, worker performance may not be correctly measured.

Current Data on the Project: The team will review past caseload/workload analyses including the current analysis being conducted on a small sampling basis in the regions. Team members may need to research current literature on workloads to assist in developing the methodology. Contacts should be made with the University of Utah's Research Department in the School of Social Work to seek any available assistance to the project.

Time Frame for Project Completion:

1. Phase One: Phase one as outlined below should be completed by October 31, 2004.
2. Phase Two: Completed by April 30, 2005
3. Phase Three: Report by May 15, 2005
4. Phase Four: Final Report June 15, 2005
5. Phase Five: Continuing

Work Plan:

1. Phase One: During this phase, the team will be organized, current workload efforts reviewed and a methodology developed to pilot in one or more regions. The team will consist of representatives from the state office and at least one (two preferred) from each region. A regional administrator, caseworkers from each service area and one or more supervisors are to be represented on the team. The team will determine whether to initiate the study statewide or select specific region(s) to pilot the study. Regional directors and supervisors will be involved in selection of caseworkers to participate in the study. The workgroup will recommend any characteristics for workers to be selected including experience, current caseload, quality case review results of the worker's cases, and other factors, including case process reviews and OSR's quality case reviews, that need be considered as a potential effect on the study outcomes. In addition, it may be important to look at differences between workers who started with the Division after the Practice Model training vs. those who carried cases before and after the Practice Model. The tool should be designed so as to intrude as little as possible on a caseworker's current workload. The study tool will be distributed to all selected caseworkers no later than October 15, 2004 with instructions to caseworkers for documenting the study. The team will determine if additional training will be required. The workgroup will develop criteria for selection of caseworkers to be included in the study
2. Phase Two: Caseworkers selected for the study will document their time for each of the factors selected for the period determined by the study team. Unless decided otherwise, out-of-home cases will be documented for a six-month period (November 1 to April 30), in-home for three months and CPS cases for the duration of the case. Team members will periodically visit with caseworkers involved in the study to answer questions and encourage their continued participation. The study will also record any changes in caseload for the workers and the number of new cases assigned during the study period. Problems discovered during the study will be documented for correction in subsequent studies.
3. Phase Three: The workgroup will analyze the results of the study and prepare a draft report of initial findings to the Administrative Team. The report will identify the factors that contribute most to workload and those factors that vary greatest depending on type of case studied. The report will include recommendations for actions for 1) further study, 2) changes in the methodology, 3) factors to utilize in assigning caseloads, and 4) other factors determined by the workgroup to be important to management and effective distribution of workloads.
4. Phase Four: A final report will be issued to the Administrative Team incorporating suggestions following the review of the initial report. The report will also include any recommended impact on current practice guidelines.
5. Phase Five: If the workgroup recommends and administration agrees, the study will continue. If the initial study was a pilot in selected regions or offices, the continuation may be expanded to include all regions and offices.

If the initial study was representative of all regions/offices, it may be determined to continue indefinitely with small random samples to build a greater database of information and/or measure the impact of changes in casework practices/requirements and impact of training. If it is determined to continue the study, Phase Five will include parameters for the continuation including timelines, participants, reporting schedules, etc.

Team Boundaries and Guidelines: Team members selected for the workgroup are expected to commit to the assignments given and attend all meetings. Should a team member be unable to attend a meeting, he/she will be responsible to assign someone to attend for them and present on their assigned task. The team will be required to maintain notes of actions and assignments and provide a copy via Groupwise to all members of the team. The workgroup will assign or rotate the assignment for taking and distributing notes. Team chairs are responsible for setting meeting times and places.

Where it is impossible or impracticable for a team member to attend, arrangements should be made for telephone participation.

EXHIBIT F

Workload Study Methodology

This methodology defines the approach to the workload and the supervisor/caseworker ratio studies. The DCFS workload study (Part A) begins February 1 and runs for approximately six months. The purpose of the study is to determine those elements of a caseload that require the most effort, determine differences between rural and urban cases, impact of workload on caseloads, effect of caseworker experience and training on workload, and other factors affecting time required to complete a case. Overall, the intent is to determine the factors contributing to the workload generated by a case as similar caseloads may not generate similar workloads. Findings will be compared to prior studies and data from the Child Welfare League of America. Part B of the study reviews supervisor workloads, span of control and recommends supervisor/caseworker ratios.

Part A. – Workload Study

Duration of Study:

- Out-of-home case: Six months or until the case is closed, whichever is shorter.
- In-home case: Six months or until the case is closed, whichever is shorter.
- CPS case: Full length of case from start to finish.

Management of Study:

- **Organization:** The workload study is under the direction of the Workload Workgroup chartered on June 4, 2004. This study methodology is made a part of the workgroup charter and where study detail contradicts the charter, this methodology supersedes the original charter. The group consists of a co-chair from the state office and a co-chair from a region (Regional director or assistant regional director) and one or more representatives from each region. In addition, the state data and training teams are represented in the workgroup.
- **Responsibility:**
 - Regional coordinators are responsible to assist caseworkers in the study by assigning the case selected by the state office, assisting in setting up the time-logs in SAFE, monitoring input into time-logs, and assisting with any other concerns caseworkers may present.
 - State Office representatives select cases, disseminate information regarding the study to regional coordinators and caseworkers, set up tracking method for data entry, help problem solve data entry issues, prepare status reports from time-logs, analyze data and prepare reports of the results of the study.
- **Overall Direction:** The workgroup reports to the state administrative team composed of the state office administrative team, regional directors and others as the Administrative Team may elect to include.
- **Monitoring Time Recording:** Recording time in the log provided in SAFE allows the production of the following reports to assist in assuring both timely and accurate recording:

- Weekly report to supervisors of workers who have recorded time in the SAFE time-log.
- Monthly report requiring reporting back from supervisors for workers who have not entered time during the past four weeks.
- Spot checks by state office staff of records in SAFE to evaluate frequency and any apparent inaccuracies in time recording.
- **Initial Comparison with Legislative Audit Study:** The study conducted by the Office of the Legislative Auditor was completed in September 2002 (audit Number 2002-05), prior to the implementation of the Practice Model. Their recommendations for caseload standards was based on their time log study. They requested that 50 caseworkers maintain a daily log for a one-month period of time. They were able to use logs of 26 caseworkers. In addition to case-related time, the study included non-case related activities including training, office time, leave, breaks, travel time and time assisting co-workers. The case-related breakout is quite similar to that proposed in the current study with eight breakouts compared to 9-13 in the current study.. The current study does provide additional breakouts of time in some categories. For example, the Legislative Audit had a “communication” activity whereas the current study includes: client contact, other contacts and child and family team activities as separate breakouts. However, it is felt that the two studies can be reasonably compared. The current study does not record non-case related time as the Legislative Audit study and all other studies are consistent in determining that 30-32% of the caseworker time is used for such non-case related activities, leaving 68-70% for case-related activities.

Selection of Case:

- With the exception of those workers asked to select the next new case assigned, all out-of-home and in-home cases are randomly selected and assigned by the state office. Should the selected case close within 30 days of initial recording, the worker will notify the state office and another case will be selected.
- All CPS workers and a selected number of in-home and out-of home workers will follow the first case assigned after February 1, 2006 and follow that case until completed or for a six-month period, whichever ends sooner. Due to the large population of CPS cases, workers will follow a second case beginning May 1.

Caseworkers to Participate:

- All caseworkers carrying a full load (eight or more cases) will be asked to log time spent on one case.
- Family Preservation workers will be asked to follow one case regardless of caseload.
- With few exceptions, workers with less than a full load will also be asked to log time spent on one case. This is to measure any difference in time required by a new worker (generally one with less than a full load) compared to workers with a full load).

Case Transfers:

- If a case transfers to another worker, discontinue logging time for the case transferred and the worker transferring the case will be assigned another case to follow. It was determined not to follow the case through the transfer as the receiving worker would be following two cases. It is important that the study not impact the caseworker's ability to provide continued quality casework.
- Temporary assignment of a case being followed: If a supervisor or another worker is temporarily assigned a case, the worker temporarily assigned to the case will continue to maintain the log on the case until the case is permanently assigned.

Recording Time:

- All time worked on the selected case by the caseworker will be recorded. Time worked by others (assistant caseworkers, supervisors, adoption specialists, etc.) will not be recorded. (We may implement a future study of time involved by these persons on cases).
- Time will be recorded in 15 minute (quarter-hour) increments. Any portion over seven minutes of the quarter will be rounded up, seven or less rounded down. For example one to seven minutes will not be recorded. Eight to 22 minutes will be counted as a quarter hour, 23 to 37 minutes as one-half hour, etc.
- Workers will record time daily if possible, not less frequently than weekly. A worker may record time in a separate log such as a planner when not in a position to record directly into SAFE if the time is transcribed into SAFE as soon as possible.
- Time will be recorded on form in SAFE specific to the type of case (in-home, out-or-home or CPS)

Recording use of Time on Log: Time spent on a case will be recorded on the log in SAFE by the breakdown shown below. This is a significant change from prior studied that attempted to follow up to 135 items for a case. If a particular activity consumes a significant portion of the time for a case, a follow-up study may break that activity down into smaller discrete functions.

- CPS: Record all time in 15 minute intervals in the appropriate activity as listed. The activities are:

Activity		
No.	Title	Description
1	Preparation for Investigation	Includes receiving and reviewing details of case and review of prior referrals and history in SAFE
2	Client Contacts	Visit with child and family, interviews of child and family, Include time for attempted contacts

3	Other Contacts	Contacts with police, school, medical staff, referent, etc
4	Travel	Time spent in vehicle to and from visits, interviews, court, etc.
5	Documentation	Recording of notes or other data into SAFE or other documents. Does not include taking notes during interviews
6	Removal Activities	Includes obtaining warrant, placing child in shelter or other placement. Kinship background checks & home study.
7	Setting up for On-going Services	Includes transfer of case, functional assessment, Child & Family Team, pre-trial.
8	Oversight Activates	Review by FCCRB, OSR, OCPO, QCR Review and CPR Review, QA review & case staffing.
9	Other	Briefly describe activity

- In-home Cases: Activities are:

Activity		
No.	Title	Description
1	Initiate Case	Includes consultation with referring worker, review of information, gathering paperwork.
2	Client Contact	Phone calls, visits, etc with children/family.
3	Other Contacts	Phone calls, discussions, visits with persons outside family
4	Child/Family Teaming Activities	Includes all time involved in setting up, pre-conferencing and conducting team meetings, developing child and family plan, taking notes during meeting and following up on team assignments.

5	Documentation	Recording Child and Family Plan from notes, entering in SAFE, Activity logs, etc.
6	Court Activities	Time spent preparing for court or in court.
7	Travel	Time spent in vehicle to and from visits, interviews, court, etc.
8	Oversight Activities	Review by FCCRB, OSR, OCPO, QCR Review and CPR Review
9	Other	

- Out-of-home Cases: Activities are:

Activity		
No.	Title	Description
1	Initiating Case	Includes transfer activities, Medicaid elig., review of case, etc.
2	Client Contact	Visits, phone calls, letters, etc., with child and family including observation of family interaction with child
3	Other Contacts	All phone calls & visits with persons outside family
4	Placement Activities	Activates related to research for placement, meeting with new caregivers, discussions with others regarding placement, ICPC activities.
5	Court Activities	Time spent preparing for court or in court.
6	Child and Family Team Activities	Includes all time involved in setting up and conducting team meetings including taking notes during meeting. Includes time for reunification activities
7	Documentation	Recording data in SAFE from notes or other sources, Completing forms, etc.

8	ICWA Activities	Requesting ICWA information, researching tribes, contact & visits w/tribes, etc.
9	Independent Living Services	Time specific to independent living activities/services
10	Adoption Process	Time with prospective adoptive families, working with adoption specialists and other time specific to adoption
11	Oversight Activities	Review by FCCRB, OSR, OCPO, QCR Review and CPR Review, QA reviews.
12	Travel	Time spent in vehicle to and from visits, interviews, court, etc.
13	Other	

Analyzing and Reporting Results of Workload Study:

- **Analyzing Study:** With the logs contained in SAFE, the data team will be able to automate the accumulation of the information. Elements for consideration in the analysis include:
 - Urban vs. Rural cases. Rural includes all of Eastern Region, all of Southwest Region except Cedar City and St. George and the following offices in other regions all others will be consider as urban cases:
 - Western: Nephi, Delta, Fillmore
 - Northern: None
 - Salt Lake Valley: None
 - Age of Case, New vs. older case
 - Experience of caseworker, caseload of caseworker, turnover of team members.
 - Type of Out-of-home case based on:
 - Goal of case
 - Location of child with reference to Region caseworker
 - Single child or siblings in care
 - Reason for entry into care
 - Type of In-home case based on:
 - Court-ordered or voluntary
 - Family Preservation
 - Counseling type case
 - Type of CPS case based on:
 - Supported, not supported, or without merit
 - Serious vs. non-serious abuse
 - Substance abuse related

- Allegation type
 - Status of Practice Model training by caseworker at time study begins.
- **Comparing Study Results with Other Studies/standards**
 - Legislative Audit Study of 2002
 - Methodology comparison
 - Scope of study
 - Study recommendations
 - DCFS Focus Group Studies
 - Methodology comparison
 - Comparison of recommendations
 - Child Welfare League of America
 - Comparison of caseload recommendations
- **Reporting Results of Study:** A preliminary report will be prepared after analysis of the data and presented to the State Administrative Team and other entities identified in the Court stipulation for review. As a minimum, the report will include:
 - Average, minimum and maximum time spend in each activity for a case
 - Average time for urban vs. rural cases
 - Any significant differences due to the factors addressed above under “Analyzing Study”
 - Areas where further study is warranted based on significant time in a particular activity, insufficient data in an activity, other factors subject to analysis or any other area the Administrative Team determines of possible significance.
 - Suggestions for allocation of caseloads based on results of the study.
 - Comparison of prior studies and analyses of differences

Part B - Supervisor/Caseworker Ratio Study

- **Purpose of study**
 - Review current span of supervision for supervisors
 - Compare current ratios with other agencies and with child welfare agencies in other states
 - Identify factors that influence ability to supervise staff
 - Determine appropriate ratio for DCFS front-line supervisors
- **Duration of Study**
 - Same overall period as basic workload study
 - Interviews conducted during May 2007
 - Logs maintained for selected supervisors May and June
 - Study report prepared by August 1, 2007

- **General Study Methodology**
 - Interview randomly selected number of supervisors
 - Interview supervisors in different service areas
 - Include supervisors who have lead workers and those who do not
 - Include supervisors who supervise Sr. and Assistant Caseworkers and those who do not
 - Include supervisors who supervise staff in different locations
 - Develop log for supervisors to maintain record of all activities for one month identifying the following categories of activity:
 - Direct supervision of staff
 - Meetings with staff individually and as team member
 - Client related
 - Performance related
 - Training of staff
 - Mentoring staff
 - Sharing staff workload
 - Time spent in meetings, training, etc, not directly staff related
 - Time with public other than clients of staff
 - Collect data from other states on supervisor/staff ratios
 - Analyze data from interviews, logs and other states to develop report and recommendations.
- **Reporting Results of Study**
 - Comparison of Utah with other states
 - Results from study
 - Time available
 - Current ratios
 - Supervisor's Recommendations
 - Study recommendations